REMARKS

In the Office a ti n, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-20. In addition, the Examiner objected to the Abstract. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in light of the foregoing amendment and the following remarks.

Claim 20 is Definite

In paragraph 5 of the Official action, the Examiner rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner alleged that there is insufficient antecedent basis for "initiating a corrected service order" and "a service order control system." The foregoing amendment to Claim 20 replaces "initiating a corrected service order" with "correcting the service order." It is submitted that there is sufficient antecedent basis for "correcting the service order."

Claim 20 recites "updating a database associated with a service order control system." It is submitted that the phrase "updating a database associated with a service control order system" is definite and thus, the rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112 is improper.

Storch Does Not Describe, Teach or Suggest the Invention of Claims 1-9 And 11-20

In paragraph 8 of the Official action, the Examiner rejected Claim 1-9 and 11-20 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,920,846 to *Storch et al.* ("*Storch*"). *Storch* describes that the transfer of information associated with processing a service order is typically classified into one of three tiers, Tier 1, Tier 2 or Tier 3. Tier 1 refers to the transfer of information before any facility assignments or work related functions had been performed and Tier 2 refers to the transfer of information after facility assignments have been assigned. Column 56, lines 25-40.

Independent Claims 1, 11 and 17 recite a service order. The foregoing amendment to Claims 1, 11 and 17 clarifies that the service order includes any necessary facilities assignments. Thus, any citations to *Storch* that reference Tier 1 communications are an improper basis for rejecting the claims. For example, in rejecting Claim 1, the Examiner cited column 55, lines 60-67, column 56, lines 1-21 and column 56, lines 41-48 and 62-65 of *Storch*. However, these sections all describe Tier 1 communications. Although the Examiner's citation to column 57, lines 8-37 refers to a Tier 2 communication, the cited section of *Storch* describes the initial determination of whether a dispatch is required for a service order. The claims recite a service order where the initial determination has already been made and a dispatch is specified. The claims are directed to processing a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments and that specifies a dispatch to determine whether the specified dispatch is unnecessary.

Moreover, the cited sections of *Storch* do not describe that a previously specified dispatch associated with a service is canceled. As described above, the cited section of *Storch* only describes the initial determination of whether a dispatch is required for a service order. The cited sections of *Storch* do not describe that once it is determined that a service order requires a dispatch, that the dispatch is canceled if the dispatch is determined to be unnecessary. Claims 1 and 17 recite determining if a dispatch is unnecessary if the service order meets a set of predefined criteria. Dependent Claims 2-6 and 18-19 further define the set of predetermined criteria.

Claim 2 recites determining whether the service order was initiated by a competitive local exchange carrier (CLEC). The Examiner cites various sections of *Storch* in rejecting Claim 2. However, none of the cited sections of *Storch* describe determining whether a service order was initiated by a CLEC.

In rejecting Claim 3, the Examiner cited column 59, lines 2-21 of *Storch*. The cited section of *Storch* describes the use of an override code to ignore closed or unavailable appointment times. The preceding amendment to Claim 3 clarifies that the override code recited by Claim 3 forces a dispatch regardless of the normal

7

dispatch determination by a work management center. Therefore, the override code described by *Storch* is distinguishable from the override code recited by Claim 3.

In rejecting Claim 4, the Examiner cited sections of *Storch* that relate to Tier 1 communications. The cited sections of *Storch* describe determining the type of service order, for example new connect, disconnecting existing service, move from one address to another address, etc. However, the cited sections of *Storch* do not describe determining whether the service order is related to a second pending service order, as recited by Claim 4.

The Examiner rejected Claim 6 by citing sections of *Storch* that describe the processing of a service order to determine facility assignments. Claim 6 recites determining whether the facilities assigned for a service order are the same facilities that were previously assigned to a location associated with the service order in order to determine whether a service order indicates an unnecessary dispatch. The cited section of *Storch* only describes the assignment of facilities. It does not describe determining whether the facilities are the same facilities previously assigned to a location associated with the service order, as recited by Claim 6.

The Examiner rejected Claim 7 by citing sections of *Storch* that describe the initial determination of whether a dispatch is required for a service order. In contrast, Claim 7 recites correcting the service order so that a dispatch associated with the service order is canceled. Claim 7 defines correcting a service order after a dispatch determination has been made, whereas the cited section of *Storch* describes the initial determination of whether a dispatch is necessary for a service order. Similarly, Claims 15 and 17 recite correcting a service order to cancel a dispatch.

Claims 8 and 12 recite placing a dispatch on hold if the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined time period to allow time to determine whether the dispatch is unnecessary. A dispatch order is placed on hold if the trap service order system determines that the dispatch might occur before a corrected service can be generated and processed through the system to cancel the existing dispatch order. By placing the dispatch on hold, the dispatch will not occur as scheduled. Application

8

page 8, lines 3-7. The cited sections of *Storch* do not describe that a dispatch can be canceled once it has been determined that a dispatch is required.

With respect to Claim 12, the Examiner alleged that the status of the service order is updated prior to be transmitted to the SORD (Service Order Retrieval and Distribution) system and that the dispatch is on hold prior to the time that the final status information is received by the SORD system. Claim 12 recites that if the dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined period of time and if the trap service order system determines that the dispatch is unnecessary, then the trap service orders system communicates with the work management center to place the dispatch on hold. The cited section of *Storch* does not describe the determiing that a dispatch is scheduled to occur within a predetermined period of time, as recited by Claims 8 and 12.

In rejecting Claim 9, the Examiner cited column 56, lines 41-62 which describes a Tier 1 communication. In addition, the Examiner cited column 59, lines 13-21 which describe a statistical analysis of past or completed service orders. In contrast, Claim 9 recites searching a database of pending service orders.

Claim 11 recites a trap service order system for monitoring a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments to determine whether a dispatch is unnecessary. The sections of *Storch* cited by the Examiner in rejecting Claim 11 describe determining whether the service order requires a dispatch. The cited sections of *Storch* do not describe determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary once the dispatch has been specified for the service order.

In rejecting Claim 13, the Examiner alleged that when changes are made to the initial facilities assignment, the changes are sent back to DUDAS (Due Date Availability System). DUDAS manages appointment dates and times. Column 55, lines 4-8. DUDAS does not manage the assignment of facilities as alleged by the Examiner. Nor does DUDAS update a database in a facility assignment system if it is determined that a dispatch is unnecessary, as recited by Claim 13.

In rejecting Claim 15, the Examiner cited sections of *Storch* that describe how DUDAS manages appointment times. In particular, the cited sections of *Storch* describe that if an appointment is canceled, DUDAS adjusts the available time for the time interval in which the appointment was previously scheduled to make time available for another appointment. However, the cited sections of *Storch* do not describe the generation of a corrected service order, as recited by Claim 15.

Storch and *Farris* Do Not, Either Singularly or in Combination, Describe, Teach or Suggest the Invention of Claim 10

In paragraph 29 in the Office action, the Examiner rejected Claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Storch* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,619 to *Farris et al.* ("*Farris*"). The Examiner admitted that *Storch* does not describe periodically generating a report based on selected ones of the predefined criteria. However, the Examiner alleged that *Farris* describes periodically generating a report. In support of this allegation, the Examiner cited a section of *Farris* that describes a ready-to-serve (RTS) processor that provides various types of reports regarding RTS data inventory. The RTS element stores data which includes address information, network facility data and telephone number data. Column 17, lines 5-7. However, the cited section of *Farris* does not describe the generation of a report that includes service orders that meet a selected predefined criteria, as recited by Claim 10.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the pending claims are allowable and allowance of the claims is requested. If there are any issues that can be addressed via a telephone conference, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 404.685.6799.

Respectfully submitted,

Brenda O. Holmes
Reg. No. 40,339

Kilpatrick Stockton LLP
1100 Peachtree Street
Suite 2800
Atlanta, Georgia 30309
(404) 815-6500
BellSouth File: 98041
KS File: 36968/211182 (19260-1800)

11

Version of the Amendments with Markings Showing Changes Made

1.   A method for eliminating an unnecessary dispatch of a service technician when a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments indicates a dispatch is required, comprising:

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicates the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch;

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary; and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then canceling a dispatch associated with the service order.

3.   The method of Claim 1, wherein determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

determining whether the service order includes an override code requiring dispatch of a service technician regardless of a dispatch determination by a work management center.

4.   The method of Claim 1, wherein determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria comprises:

determining whether the service order is related to a second pending service order.

9.   The method of Claim 1, wherein determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary comprises:

in response to receiving a query based upon selected ones of the predefined criteria, searching a database of pending service orders that indicate a dispatch is required to locate service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria; and

providing the service orders that meet the selected predefined criteria.

11.   A system for eliminating unnecessary dispatches, comprising:

a service order control system for receiving [the] service requests from a source and for generating a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments;

a work management center for receiving the service order from the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch; and

a trap service order system for monitoring the service order generated by the service order control system and for determining whether the service order requires a dispatch, and if so, determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary by comparing a service order type and information in a selected field of the service order with a set of predefined criteria that indicate the service order is likely to cause an unnecessary dispatch.

17.   A method for eliminating a dispatch of a service technician specified by a service order that includes any necessary facilities assignments which is unnecessary, comprising:

determining whether the service order meets a set of predefined criteria that indicate a likelihood of an unnecessary dispatch by examining selected sections of the service order;

if the service order meets the set of predefined criteria, then determining whether the dispatch is unnecessary; and

if the dispatch is unnecessary, then eliminating the dispatch by correcting the service order and canceling a dispatch order for the dispatch.

20.   The method of Claim 17, wherein correcting the [initiating a] corrected service order comprises updating a database associated with a service order control system.